Reionization in an interacting dark energy cosmology

Xiaodong Xu

Department of Mathematics and Applied Mathematics,
University of Cape Town, Rondebosch 7701, Cape Town, South Africa

Jun Zhang and Bin Wang

Department of Physics and Astronomy,
Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200240, China

arXiv:1702.06358v1 [astro-ph.CO] 21 Feb 2017

Abstract

We consider the reionization process in a cosmological model in which dark matter interacts with dark energy. Using a semi-analytical reionization model, we compute the evolution of the ionized fraction in terms of its spatial average and linear perturbations. We show that certain types of interactions between dark matter and dark energy can significantly affect the reionization history. We calculate the 21 cm signals in the interaction models, and compare the results with the predictions of the ΛCDM model.

I. INTRODUCTION

It has become a well established observational fact that our universe is undergoing an accelerated expansion [1, 2]. The simplest theory to account for the accelerated expansion in the framework of General Relativity(GR) is a positive cosmological constant, an old ingredient in GR since its very beginning. Before the discovery of the accelerated expansion, researchers have already encountered the missing mass problem: there is a mismatch between the dynamics and distribution of visible matter from the scale of galaxy to the scale of the cosmic microwave background(CMB) radiation [2–10]. To explain the mass discrepancy, one usually postulates the existence of dark matter(DM). The cosmological constant(Λ), cold dark matter(CDM), together with normal matter and radiation constitute the matter components in the standard cosmological model, ΛCDM model. Yet, theoretically the cosmological constant suffers from some problems such as the cosmological constant problem and the coincidence problem [11, 12]. Researchers have explored a variety of scenarios to describe the late time accelerated expansion beyond the cosmological constant. Great amounts of such efforts involve replacing the cosmological constant in ΛCDM model with some exotic forms of matter fields with negative pressure, so-called dark energy(DE). Meanwhile, ΛCDM is also in trouble in explaining the latest observations. It is found that there is a 3σ mismatch between the Hubble constant H_0 measured in the direct local measurement [13] and the value inferred from the CMB experiment if ΛCDM is assumed [14]. It is then reasonable to resort to dark energy models for reconciliation between the observations.

If dark energy is responsible for the accelerated expansion, our universe's energy density is dominated by dark matter and dark energy today. The natures of both remain unknown. There is no detection of non-gravitational interaction of DM or DE with baryonic matter and radiation to date. From the field theory point of view, it is interesting to consider if dark sectors, two biggest components of our universe, interact with each other. It was found that suitable interaction between DM and DE can help to alleviate the coincidence problem. Confronting to observations, it was observed that DE and DM interaction is allowed by astronomical observations. Readers can refer to [15] for a review on theoretical challenges, cosmological implications and observational signatures in interacting dark energy(IDE) models.

The signatures of IDE models have been disclosed in various astronomical observations[16–40]. Since DE is prominent at redshift $z \lesssim 2$, it is informative to test interacting DE models with observations at low redshift based on the expansion history of our universe, such as the measurement of the Hubble constant and the luminosity/angular diameter distances' tests etc, and different observations from large scale structures. Besides, considering that the interaction extends the effect to larger redshifts and could even alter the sequence of cosmological eras, it is interesting to examine the IDE models at high redshift observations. At present, the most accurate and information-rich observational data come from the experiments measuring the temperature and polarization anisotropies of CMB. From the CMB temperature anisotropies, clear nonzero signature of the interaction between DE and DM has been obtained, see [15] and references therein and also recent result in [41]. Apart from the CMB radiation, it is also worth exploring what signals the IDE models left at redshifts that bridge the gap between accelerated expansion phase and the CMB era. It is therefore useful to extend our study and further constrain the IDE models at high redshifts.

Observationally, probes to the dark ages and epoch of reionization(EoR), ranging from $z \simeq 1100$ to $z \simeq 6$, are much less rich and accurate than low redshift observations. We have

several observational evidences from which information of EoR can be inferred. The CMB experiments constrain the electron scattering optical depth to the last scattering surface[42]. The redshift evolution of QSO spectra and Lyα emitters provide hints of reionization history at $z \gtrsim 6$ [43–47]. Furthermore, detection of 21cm radiation signals is expected to unveil the history of the universe during EoR. The 21cm line corresponds to the transition between the fundamental hyperfine levels of neutral hydrogen(HI) atoms. Several ongoing 21cm radio telescopes and interferometers, including LOFAR [48, 49], MWA [50, 51], PAPER [52–54], HERA [55], BINGO [56] and the upcoming SKA-LOW [57], are aiming to detect the 21cm signals from the epoch of reionization. Considering the promising experimental results in the near future, it is of great interest to carry out theoretical analysis of signatures of IDE model in the reionization era in this work.

The brightness temperature fluctuation of the redshifted 21cm signal reflects the distributions of HI, which serves as a tracer of the 3D large scale structure of the universe. In order to interprete observational data and constrain cosmological models, a model of reionization on large scales is necessary. In principle, hydrodynamic simulations offer reliable way of modeling reionization process [58–70]. However, simulations are limited by the scale range it can cover. It is difficult for the simulations to have large box size to adopt large scale correlations while still be able to resolve the necessary small scale structure, even with the state-of-art computer capabilities. Furthermore, we need to explore various parameters in order to constrain cosmological models, thus computationally less expensive, semi-analytic models, e.g. [71–74], are preferred. In this work, we will employ the reionization model developed in [75] and examine the imprint of the interaction between dark sectors in this reionization model.

The organization of our paper is the following: in the next section we will review the IDE models and list its linear perturbation equations. In Sec.III and Sec.IV, we will go over the semi-analytical reionization description and explain the way to calculate the 21cm radiation power spectrum. In Sec.V, we will report how the reionization process and the 21cm radiation power spectrum will be modified if there is interaction between DE and DM. Our conclusion and discussion will be given in the final section.

II. INTERACTING DARK ENERGY MODEL

In the interacting DM-DE scenario, the energy momentum tensor of DM and DE are not conserved separately, but

$$\nabla_\mu T^{\mu\nu}_{(\lambda)} = Q^\nu_{(\lambda)}, \tag{1}$$

where the subscript 'λ' refers to either DM('c') or DE('d'). $Q^\nu_{(\lambda)}$ is the coupling vector representing the interaction between DM and DE. We assume that the dark sectors do not interact with normal matter in addition to gravitational interactions, thus the total energy momentum of dark sectors is conserved, so that $Q_\mathrm{c} + Q_\mathrm{d} = 0$.

The universe is described by a flat Friedmann-Lemaitre-Robertson-Walker(FLRW) metric with small perturbations over a smooth background. The line element is given by

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = a^2[-(1+2\psi)\mathrm{d}\tau^2 + 2\partial_i B \mathrm{d}\tau \mathrm{d}x^i + (1+2\phi)\delta_{ij}\mathrm{d}x^i\mathrm{d}x^j + (\partial_i\partial_j - \frac{1}{3}\delta_{ij}\nabla^2)E\mathrm{d}x^i\mathrm{d}x^j], \tag{2}$$

where we have only considered the scalar perturbations to the metric (ψ, B, ϕ and E). In the following, we work in Newtonian gauge such that $B = E = 0$.

The matter components in the universe are described by the energy momentum tensor of ideal fluid

$$T^{\mu\nu} = (\rho + p)U^\mu U^\nu + pg^{\mu\nu}. \tag{3}$$

Given (1), we obtain the equations of motions for the DM/DE energy densities in the homogeneous and isotropic background

$$\dot{\rho_c} + 3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\rho_c = a^2 Q_{\rm c}^0 = aQ_{\rm c}, \tag{4}$$

$$\dot{\rho_d} + 3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}(1+w)\rho_d = a^2 Q_{\rm d}^0 = aQ_{\rm d}, \tag{5}$$

A dot denotes the derivative with respect to conformal time. w is the equation of state of DE, which is assumed constant in time throughout the paper. Due to lack of understandings about either dark matter or dark energy at present, it is difficult to postulate the couplings between them from first principles. Hence we would instead describe the interaction phenomenologically and focus on its impact on the dynamics of the universe rather than the microscopic mechanism. In this work, we parameterize the energy transfer between DM and DE as a function of their energy densities [25]

$$Q_{\rm c} = -Q_{\rm d} = 3H(\xi_1\rho_{\rm c} + \xi_2\rho_{\rm d}). \tag{6}$$

ξ_1 and ξ_2 are the dimensionless coupling coefficients, which we assume to be constants. While it is a simple parametrization of DM-DE interaction, we can put some constraints on the coupling constants as well as DE EoS w by some physical considerations. First, to avoid the unphysical solution of a negative dark energy density ($\rho_{\rm d} < 0$) in the early universe, the coupling constant ξ_1 must be positive [76]. Furthermore, it has been found that, when $\xi_1 \neq 0$ and w is a constant greater than -1, the curvature perturbation diverges in early times [26, 77, 78]. Thus we exclude such cases in our study. The linear perturbation to the zeroth component of the coupling vector can be derived from (6) [25]:

$$\delta Q^0_{(\lambda)} = -\frac{\psi}{a}Q_{(\lambda)} + \frac{1}{a}\delta Q_{(\lambda)}, \tag{7}$$

while the ith component needs to be specified in the model in addition to the background energy transfer. In this work, we assume $\delta Q^i_{(\lambda)}$ vanishes, i.e., there is no scattering between DM and DE, and only an inertial drag effect appears due to stationary energy transfer.

In the Newtonian gauge, the perturbed energy momentum nonconservation equation (1) leads to, on the first order, [25]

$$\dot{\delta_{\rm c}} = -kv_{\rm c} - 3\dot{\phi} + 3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}(\xi_1 + \xi_2/r_{\rm D})\psi + 3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\xi_2(\delta_{\rm d} - \delta_{\rm c})/r_{\rm D}, \tag{8}$$

$$\dot{v_{\rm c}} = -\frac{\dot{a}}{a}v_{\rm c} + k\psi - 3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}(\xi_1 + \xi_2/r_{\rm D})v_{\rm c}, \tag{9}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\delta_{\rm d}} =& -3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}(c_{\rm e}^2 - w)\delta_{\rm d} - 9\Big(\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\Big)^2(c_{\rm e}^2 - c_{\rm a}^2)(1+w)\frac{v_{\rm d}}{k} - (1+w)kv_{\rm d} - 3(1+w)\dot{\phi} \\ & - 9\Big(\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\Big)^2(c_{\rm e}^2 - c_{\rm l}^2)(\xi_1 r_{\rm D} + \xi_2)\frac{v_{\rm d}}{k} - 3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}(\xi_1 r_{\rm D} + \xi_2)\psi + 3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\xi_1 r_{\rm D}(\delta_{\rm d} - \delta_{\rm c}),\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{v_{\rm d}} =& -\frac{\dot{a}}{a}(1-3w)v_{\rm d} + \frac{k}{1+w}c_{\rm e}^2\delta_{\rm d} + 3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}(c_{\rm d}^2 - c_{\rm a}^2)v_{\rm d} - \frac{\dot{w}}{1+w}v_{\rm d} + k\psi \\ & + 3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}(c_{\rm e}^2 - c_{\rm a}^2)(\xi_1 r_{\rm D} + \xi_2)\frac{v_{\rm d}}{1+w} + 3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}(\xi_1 r_{\rm D} + \xi_2)v_{\rm d},\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where $r_{\rm D}\equiv\rho_{\rm c}/\rho_{\rm d}$; $c_{\rm a}\equiv\frac{\dot{p}_{\rm d}}{\dot{\rho}_{\rm d}}$ is the adiabatic sound speed and $c_{\rm e}\equiv\frac{\delta p_{\rm d}}{\delta\rho_{\rm d}}$ is the effective sound speed of DE in its rest frame.

As DM and DE do not interact with normal matter except through their gravitational effect, the physics of baryonic matter remains the same as in ΛCDM model. In particular, the equations of motion for its mean energy density and linear perturbations read

$$\dot{\rho}_{\rm b}+3\frac{\dot{a}}{a}\rho_{\rm b}=0, \tag{12}$$

and

$$\dot{\delta}_{\rm b}=-kv_{\rm b}-3\dot{\phi}, \tag{13}$$

$$\dot{v}_{\rm b}=-\frac{\dot{a}}{a}v_{\rm b}+k\psi. \tag{14}$$

III. REIONIZATION MODEL

In this section, we briefly review the semi-analytical model developed in [75], which predicts the power spectrum of the HII fluctuations on large scales by solving the equations of ionization balance and radiative transfer to the first order in perturbations.

First, the equation of ionization equilibrium reads

$$\frac{\partial n_{\rm HII}}{\partial\tau}+\nabla\cdot(n_{\rm HII}\mathbf{u})=(n_{\rm H}-n_{\rm HII})\int_0^\infty{\rm d}\mu\int{\rm d}\Omega^2 n_\gamma\frac{\sigma(\mu)}{a^2(\tau)}\kappa(\mu,\phi)-\frac{\alpha_B n_{\rm HII}^2}{a^2(\tau)}, \tag{15}$$

where τ is the conformal time; $n_{\rm H}$ and $n_{\rm HII}$ are the comoving number densities of the total and ionized hydrogen atoms; $n_\gamma=n_\gamma(\mathbf{x},\tau,\mu,\mathbf{\Omega})$ is the comoving photon number density per unit volume, per unit conformal time, per unit frequency parameter and per unit solid angle. $\mathbf{\Omega}$ is the unit vector along the direction of photon propagation. The frequency parameter is defined as $\mu=\ln\nu-\ln\nu_0$, where ν is the photon's frequency and $\nu_0=13.6{\rm eV}/(2\pi\hbar)$. $\sigma(\mu)$ is the photon ionization cross section [79]. $\alpha_B=2.6\times10^{-13}{\rm cm^3s^{-1}}$ is the case B recombination coefficient at temperature equaling to 10^4K. And a is the scale factor. The factor $\kappa(\mu,\phi)=1+C(\exp(\mu)-1)(1-\phi^a)^b$ accounts for multiple ionizations by X-ray photons through secondary ionizations by the fast photoelectrons, where $\phi=n_{\rm HII}/n_{\rm H}$ is the local ionization fraction, and we adopt the parameters: $C=0.3908$, $a=0.4092$ and $b=1.7592$, following [80]. The evolution of the radiation background is described by the radiative transfer equation

$$\frac{\partial n_\gamma}{\partial\tau}+\mathbf{\Omega}\cdot\nabla n_\gamma-H(\tau)a(\tau)\frac{\partial n_\gamma}{\partial\mu}=\frac{S}{4\pi}-(n_{\rm H}-n_{\rm HII})n_\gamma\frac{\sigma(\mu)}{a^2(\tau)}, \tag{16}$$

$S(\mathbf{x},\tau,\mu,\mathbf{\Omega})/4\pi$ is the differential ionizing emissivity which gives the number of photons emitted by sources per unit volume, per unit conformal time, per unit frequency parameter and per unit solid angle. (16) includes the effects of sources, photon ionization process, diffusion of photons and redshift due to the expansion of the universe. Throughout the paper, we ignore the ionization of helium atoms and assume electric neutrality everywhere in the universe.

To solve the ionization equilibrium and radiative transfer equations, we need to specify the emissivity function and the distribution and spectrum of ionizing sources. In this work,

we employ the extended Press-Schechter formalism [81–83] to model the ionizing sources. The minimal mass of a halo which can host luminous sources is given by

$$M_{\rm min} \approx 1.3\times10^7 M_\odot \left(\frac{T_{\rm vir}}{10^4K}\right)^{3/2}\left(\frac{1+z}{21}\right)^{-3/2}\left(\frac{\Omega_m}{0.3}\right)^{-1/2}\left(\frac{h}{0.7}\right)^{-1}\left(\frac{\mu_{\rm mol}}{1.22}\right)^{-3/2}, \quad (17)$$

where $\mu_{\rm mol}$ is the mean molecular weight. On mass scale m, the fraction of mass collapsed in halos with masses larger than $M_{\rm min}$ is

$$f_{\rm m}^{\rm coll}(\mathbf{x},\tau) = {\rm erfc}\left[\frac{\delta_{\rm cri}-\delta_{\rm m}(\mathbf{x},\tau)}{\sqrt{2[\sigma^2_{\rm min}(\tau)-\sigma^2_{\rm m}(\tau)]}}\right], \quad (18)$$

where $\delta_{\rm cri}$ is the critical overdensity in the spherical collapse model; $\delta_{\rm m}$ and $\sigma_{\rm m}$ are the overdensity and variance of the density fluctuations on mass scale m and $\sigma_{\rm min}$ is the variance of density fluctuation corresponding to mass scale $M_{\rm min}$. In the following, we neglect $\sigma_{\rm m}$ since it is much smaller than $\sigma_{\rm min}$ on large scales. Smoothed over mass scale m, the emissivity function reads

$$S_{\rm m}(\mathbf{x},\mu,\tau) = \gamma(\mu)\bar{n}_{\rm H}\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}[f_{\rm m}^{\rm coll}(\mathbf{x},\tau)(1+\delta_{\rm b}(\mathbf{x},\tau))]. \quad (19)$$

$\gamma(\mu)$ represents the average number of ionizing photons emitted by each hydrogen atom in the collapsed objects per unit frequency parameter μ.

We can rewrite the number densities and emissivity in terms of their spatially averages and perturbations:

$$n_{\rm HII} = \bar{n}_{\rm H}f_{\rm HII}(\tau)[1+\delta_{\rm HII}(\mathbf{x},\tau)] = \bar{n}_{\rm H}[f_{\rm HII}(\tau)+\Delta_{\rm HII}(\mathbf{x},\tau)], \quad (20)$$

$$n_{\rm H} = \bar{n}_{\rm H}[1+\delta_{\rm b}(\mathbf{x},\tau)], \quad (21)$$

$$n_\gamma = \bar{n}_{\rm H}f_\gamma(\tau,\mu)[1+\delta_\gamma(\mathbf{x},\tau,\mu,\mathbf{\Omega})] = \bar{n}_{\rm H}[f_\gamma(\tau,\mu)+\Delta_\gamma(\mathbf{x},\tau,\mu,\mathbf{\Omega})] \quad (22)$$

$$S = \bar{n}_{\rm H}f_{\rm s}(\tau,\mu)[1+\delta_{\rm s}(\mathbf{x},\tau,\mu,\mathbf{\Omega})] = \bar{n}_{\rm H}[f_{\rm s}(\tau,\mu)+\Delta_{\rm s}(\mathbf{x},\tau,\mu,\mathbf{\Omega}], \quad (23)$$

where $f_{\rm HII}$ and f_γ are the ratio of mean ionized hydrogen atoms and photons number densities to the average total hydrogen number density $\bar{n}_{\rm H}$, and $f_{\rm s}$ is the mean source emissivity normalized by $\bar{n}_{\rm H}$. We assume that the overdensity of the total hydrogen atoms is the same as the baryon overdensity on large scales. From (15) and (16), we find the equations of the spatially averaged quantities

$$\frac{\partial f_{\rm HII}}{\partial\tau} = 4\pi(1-f_{\rm HII})\int {\rm d}\mu\frac{\sigma\bar{n}_{\rm H}}{a^2}\langle\kappa\rangle f_\gamma C^{(1)}_{\gamma{\rm H}} - \frac{\alpha_{\rm B}\bar{n}_{\rm H}}{a^2}f^2_{\rm HII}C_{\rm HII}, \quad (24)$$

$$\frac{\partial f_\gamma}{\partial\tau} = \frac{f_{\rm s}}{4\pi} + Ha\frac{\partial f_\gamma}{\partial\mu} - \frac{\sigma\bar{n}_{\rm H}}{a^2}(1-f_{\rm HII})f_\gamma C^{(2)}_{\gamma{\rm H}}, \quad (25)$$

where $C^{(1)}_{\gamma{\rm H}}$, $C^{(2)}_{\gamma{\rm H}}$ and $C_{\rm HII}$ are the clumping factors for photoionization and recombination, respectively:

$$C^{(1)}_{\gamma{\rm H}} \equiv \frac{\langle n_{\rm HI}n_\gamma\kappa\rangle}{\langle n_{\rm HI}\rangle\langle n_\gamma\rangle\langle\kappa\rangle},\ C^{(2)}_{\gamma{\rm H}} \equiv \frac{\langle n_{\rm HI}n_\gamma\rangle}{\langle n_{\rm HI}\rangle\langle n_\gamma\rangle},\ C_{\rm HII} \equiv \frac{\langle n^2_{\rm HII}\rangle}{\langle n_{\rm HII}\rangle^2}. \quad (26)$$

In Fourier space, the linear perturbations of (15) and (16) lead to

$$\frac{\partial\tilde{\Delta}_{\rm HII}}{\partial\omega} = G\tilde{\delta_{\rm b}} - F\tilde{\Delta}_{\rm HII} + \int_0^\infty {\rm d}\mu\langle\kappa\rangle\int {\rm d}^2\mathbf{\Omega}\tilde{\Delta}_\gamma B, \quad (27)$$

$$\frac{\partial\tilde{\Delta}_\gamma}{\partial\omega} = \frac{\partial\tilde{\Delta}_\gamma}{\partial\mu} - M\tilde{\Delta}_\gamma + N\tilde{\Delta}_{\rm s} + R(\tilde{\Delta}_{\rm HII}-\tilde{\delta}_{\rm b}), \quad (28)$$

where $\tilde{\Delta}_{\rm HII}$, $\tilde{\Delta}_\gamma$, $\tilde{\Delta}_{\rm s}$ and $\tilde{\delta}_{\rm b}$ are the Fourier transforms of $\Delta_{\rm HII}$, Δ_γ, $\Delta_{\rm s}$ and $\delta_{\rm b}$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
F &= 2\tilde{\alpha}_{\rm B} f_{\rm HII} + 4\pi \int_0^\infty {\rm d}\mu \tilde{\sigma} f_\gamma \left[\langle\kappa\rangle - (1-f_{\rm HII}) \frac{\partial \kappa}{\partial \phi}\bigg|_{\phi=f_{\rm HII}} \right], \\
G &= \frac{{\rm d}\ln D_{\rm b}}{{\rm d}\omega} f_{\rm HII} + 4\pi \int_0^\infty {\rm d}\mu \tilde{\sigma} f_\gamma \left[\langle\kappa\rangle - (1-f_{\rm HII}) f_{\rm HII} \frac{\partial \kappa}{\partial \phi}\bigg|_{\phi=f_{\rm HII}} \right], \\
B &= (1-f_{\rm HII})\tilde{\sigma}, \\
M &= (1-f_{\rm HII})\tilde{\sigma} - \frac{i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{\Omega}}{Ha}, \\
N &= (4\pi H a)^{-1}, \\
R &= \tilde{\sigma} f_\gamma,
\end{aligned}
$$

where $D_{\rm b}$ is the linear growth factor of baryon. For simplicity, we define $\tilde{\alpha}_{\rm B}(\tau) \equiv \alpha_{\rm B}\bar{n}_{\rm H}/(Ha^3)$ and $\tilde{\sigma}(\mu,\tau) \equiv \sigma\bar{n}_{\rm H}/(Ha^3)$.

Taking the large m limit of (19), we find the mean emissivity function

$$
f_{\rm s}(\mu,\tau) = \gamma(\mu)\frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \exp\left(-\frac{\delta_{\rm c}^2}{2\sigma_{\rm min}^2} \right) \frac{\rm d}{{\rm d}\tau}\left(-\frac{\delta_{\rm c}}{\sqrt{2\sigma_{\rm min}^2}} \right). \tag{29}
$$

The linear perturbation to the emissivity is obtained by doing Tayler expansion of (19) around $\delta_{\rm b}$:

$$
\tilde{\Delta}_{\rm s}(\mathbf{k},\mu,\tau) = \gamma(\mu)\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}[R(\tau)\tilde{\delta}_{\rm b}(\mathbf{k},\tau)], \tag{30}
$$

where

$$
R(\tau) = {\rm erfc}\left(\frac{\delta_{\rm c}}{\sqrt{2\sigma_{\rm min}^2}} \right) + \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi\sigma_{\rm min}^2}} \exp\left(-\frac{\delta_{\rm c}^2}{2\sigma_{\rm min}^2} \right). \tag{31}
$$

Numerically solving (24), (25), (27) and (28), we can calculate the linear power spectrum of ionized hydrogen atoms.

IV. 21CM RADIATION POWER SPECTRUM

During the reionization epoch, the absorption and re-emission of Lyman-α photons and nonlinear effect determine the spin temperature of hydrogen atoms, which defines the relative abundance of triplet and singlet hydrogen states. When the spin temperature departs from the CMB temperature, a net absorption or emission of the 21 cm line does appear against the CMB radiation. The difference between the observed 21 cm brightness temperature and the CMB temperature is given by[84]

$$
T_{\rm b} = \frac{3hc^3 A_{10} n_{\rm HI}}{32\pi k_{\rm B}\nu_0^2 (1+z)^2 ({\rm d}u_\parallel/dr)} \frac{T_{\rm s} - T_{\rm CMB}}{T_{\rm s}}, \tag{32}
$$

where A_{10} is the spontaneous decay rate of 21 cm transition, $n_{\rm HI}$ is the number density of the neutral hydrogen, and ν_0 is the frequency of the 21 cm transition at the rest frame. $T_{\rm s}$ is the spin temperature. The relation between $T_{\rm s}$ and the populations of the hyperfine levels is

$$
\frac{n_1}{n_0} = \frac{g_1}{g_0} {\rm e}^{-h\nu_0/k_{\rm B}T_{\rm s}}. \tag{33}
$$

$g_0 = 1$ and $g_1 = 3$ are the statistical weights. The 21 cm signal can be observed in the form of an absorption line or an emission line against the CMB blackbody spectrum, depending on whether the spin temperature is lower or higher than the CMB temperature. $\mathrm{d}u_\parallel/dr$ is the gradient of the physical velocity along the line of sight and r is the comoving distance.

The gradient of physical velocity can be split into

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}u_\parallel}{\mathrm{d}r} = \frac{H(z)}{1+z} + \frac{\partial v}{\partial r}, \tag{34}$$

where v is the peculiar velocity, $H(z)$ is the Hubble parameter at given redshift. On the background level, the peculiar velocity vanishes and $\mathrm{d}u_\parallel/\mathrm{d}r = H(z)/(1+z)$.

The average temperature difference is

$$\bar{T}_\mathrm{b} = \frac{3hc^3 A_{10}\bar{n}_\mathrm{HI}}{32\pi k_\mathrm{B}\nu_0^2}\frac{1}{(1+z)H(z)}\frac{\bar{T}_\mathrm{s} - T_\mathrm{CMB}}{\bar{T}_\mathrm{s}}. \tag{35}$$

During the reionization era, we assume $T_\mathrm{s} \gg T_\mathrm{CMB}$, thus $(T_\mathrm{s} - T_\mathrm{CMB})/T_\mathrm{s} \simeq 1$. The number density of neutral hydrogen can be written as $\bar{n}_\mathrm{HI} = f_\mathrm{HI}\bar{n}_\mathrm{b}(1 - f_\mathrm{He})$, where $\bar{n}_\mathrm{b}$ is the average baryon number density, f_HI is the average neutral fraction and f_He is the helium fraction.

Perturbing the temperature difference, we get

$$T_\mathrm{b}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\bar{T}_\mathrm{b}}{f_\mathrm{HI}}[1 - f_\mathrm{HII}(1+\delta_\mathrm{HII})](1+\delta_\mathrm{b})(1-\delta_v). \tag{36}$$

The gradient of the peculiar velocity is defined as $\delta_v \equiv \frac{\partial v}{\partial r}/\frac{H(z)}{1+z}$. In linear perturbation theory, we can write

$$\tilde{\delta}_v(\mathbf{k}) = -\frac{\mathrm{d}\ln D_\mathrm{b}}{\mathrm{d}\ln a}(\hat{\mathbf{n}}\cdot\hat{\mathbf{k}})^2\tilde{\delta}_\mathrm{b} \equiv -\tilde{\mu}^2\tilde{\delta}_\mathrm{b}, \tag{37}$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{n}}$ is the unit vector along the line of sight and $\tilde{\mu}^2 \equiv \frac{\mathrm{d}\ln D_\mathrm{b}}{\mathrm{d}\ln a}(\hat{\mathbf{n}}\cdot\hat{\mathbf{k}})^2$. D_b is the baryon growth function.

It is now straightforward to derive the 21 cm radiation power spectrum, which is defined by

$$\langle\tilde{T}_\mathrm{b}^*(\mathbf{k})\tilde{T}_\mathrm{b}(\mathbf{k}')\rangle \equiv (2\pi)^3\delta^3(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{k}')P_{\Delta T}(\mathbf{k}). \tag{38}$$

$\tilde{T}_\mathrm{b}$ is the Fourier mode of the fluctuation of the brightness temperature. Using (37) and (36), one can then compute the power spectrum as [85]:

$$P_{\Delta T}(\mathbf{k}) = \bar{T}_\mathrm{b}^2\{(P_\mathrm{bb} - 2xP_\mathrm{ib} + x^2P_\mathrm{ii}) + 2\tilde{\mu}^2(P_\mathrm{bb} - xP_\mathrm{ib}) + \tilde{\mu}^4P_\mathrm{bb}\}, \tag{39}$$

where $x = f_\mathrm{HII}/f_\mathrm{HI}$, and P_bb, P_ii and P_ib are the power spectrum of baryon density fluctuation, ionization fraction fluctuation and density-ionization cross correlation. $P_{\Delta T}$ is composed of three components, which have distinct angular dependence. We refer to them as

$$P_0 = \bar{T}_\mathrm{b}^2(P_\mathrm{bb} - 2xP_\mathrm{ib} + x^2P_\mathrm{ii}), \tag{40}$$
$$P_2 = \bar{T}_\mathrm{b}^2 2\tilde{\mu}^2(P_\mathrm{bb} - xP_\mathrm{ib}), \tag{41}$$
$$P_4 = \bar{T}_\mathrm{b}^2\tilde{\mu}^4P_\mathrm{bb}. \tag{42}$$



FIG. 1: The evolution of ionized fraction $f_{\rm HII}$. The dashed black line represents the ΛCDM model, and the solid lines represent the interacting DM-DE models with different DE EoS and coupling constant.

TABLE I: Model parameters.

	w	ξ_1	ξ_2	ζ
ΛCDM	-1	-	-	84.2
IDE-A1	-1.1	0.01	0	145.7
IDE-A2	-1.1	0.005	0	109.8
IDE-A3	-1.2	0.01	0	145.8
IDE-B1	-0.9	0	0.05	85.0
IDE-B2	-0.9	0	-0.1	82.5
IDE-B3	-1.1	0	0.1	86.5
IDE-B4	-1.1	0	-0.05	83.3

V. RESULTS

Using the method described in Sec.III, we calculate the reionization history in the presence of DM-DE interaction. For a comparison, we repeat the calculation for a fiducial ΛCDM model. The cosmological parameters for the fiducial ΛCDM model as well as the interacting DM-DE models are: today's Hubble constant $H_0 = 67\mathrm{km}\cdot\mathrm{s}^{-1}\cdot\mathrm{Mpc}^{-1}$, baryon and dark matter abundance $\Omega_{\rm b}h^2 = 0.022$, $\Omega_{\rm c}h^2 = 0.12$, and the optical depth to the begining of reionization $\tau_{\rm T} = 0.08$. Besides, we assume the expansion of the universe and evolution of the fluctuations of different energy components in interacting DM-DE models are close to those of the fiducial ΛCDM model in sufficiently early time, so that we set the Hubble parameter and linear perturbations to DM and baryons the same as ΛCDM model at $a = 0.01$.

Fig.1 shows the evolution of the ionized fraction in the interacting DM-DE models. The model parameters are listed in Table.I. For clarity, we consider two kinds of interactions: either the interaction in proportional to DM density(IDE-A), or proportional to DE density(IDE-B). In the computation, we set clumping factors

$$C_{\gamma\rm H}^{(1)} = C_{\gamma\rm H}^{(2)} = 1,\ C_{\rm HII} = 10, \tag{43}$$

and the source spectrum

$$\gamma(\mu)\mathrm{d}\mu = \frac{\zeta}{C_\beta}\mathrm{e}^{\beta+1}\mathrm{d}\mu, \tag{44}$$



(a) (b)

FIG. 2: (a) The ratio of Hubble parameter between IDE models and the fiducial ΛCDM model. (b) The ratio of linear perturbation to baryon density between IDE models and the fiducial ΛCDM model at scale $k = 0.034\text{Mpc}^{-1}$.

where β is the spectral index, ζ represents the total number of ionizing photons generated per baryon in stars, which manage to escape into the IGM, and C_β is a normalization factor. Thus the source spectrum takes a power law form in frequency. For simplicity, we assume $\beta = -3$ and tune ζ for each model in order to satisfy $\tau_{\rm T} = 0.08$.

From Fig.1, it is clear that the interaction proportional to the DE density is of little importance in the reionization history on the background level. In these models, the evolution of $f_{\rm HII}$ is indistinguishable from the ΛCDM model. When the interaction is proportional to DM energy density, however, the evolution of $f_{\rm HII}$ changes significantly. Here in order to avoid the instability in perturbations and keep DE energy density always positive, we demand $\xi_1 > 0$ and constant DE EoS $w < -1$ when $\xi_1 \neq 0$. And in this case, the reionization process is accelerated comparing to that in ΛCDM model. In our fiducial ΛCDM model, it finished at $z \simeq 7.8$, while in the model IDE-A1, it finished at $z \simeq 8.6$.

The fact that the interaction between dark sectors which is proportional to DE energy density has little influence on the reionization history is not unexpected, if we recall that the energy density of DE was negligibly small comparing to DM energy density during the reionization era, and therefore the interaction can hardly change the expansion and structure formation of the universe. As Fig.2 shows, the Hubble parameter and baryon overdensities in the IDE-B models are almost the same as in ΛCDM model before the end of reionization. As a result, the reionization histories are almost the same as in ΛCDM model, too.

To see some more details of the reionization process, we illustrate the bias of the fluctuations to the ionized fraction, $\delta_{\rm HII}$, with respect to the baryon overdensity $\delta_{\rm b}$ for $k = 0.034\text{Mpc}^{-1}$ in Fig.3. On other scales, the qualitative behaviors of perturbations are similar. All IDE models exhibit the similar behaviors as the ΛCDM model. The bias in the IDE-B models, in which the interactions are proportional to DE densities, is almost indistinguishable from the ΛCDM model. While in IDE-A model(red line) with the interaction proportional to the energy density of DM, the HII bias evolves faster, which is in accordance with the average ionized fraction $f_{\rm HII}$. The large scale bias of the HII regions is always greater than unity during the reionization era, which means that the high density region tends to be more ionized than low density region-the topology of the reionization is inside-out. Then $\delta_{\rm HII}/\delta_{\rm b}$ drops to unity, indicating the end of reionization.



FIG. 3: The bias between $\delta_{\rm HII}$ and $\delta_{\rm b}$ at scale $k = 0.034{\rm Mpc}^{-1}$. The dashed black line represents the ΛCDM model, and the solid lines represent the interacting DM-DE models with different DE EoS and coupling constant.



(a) (b)

FIG. 4: (a) The evolution of ionized fraction in IDE-A models with different parameters and the fiducial ΛCDM model. (b) The bias between $\delta_{\rm HII}$ and $\delta_{\rm b}$ at scale $k = 0.034{\rm Mpc}^{-1}$ in IDE-A models and the fiducial ΛCDM model.

The accelerated reionization in IDE-A model is induced by the high Hubble parameter during and after the reionization era. The Thomson optical depth back to the same redshift, given the same ionized fraction, would be smaller if the expansion rate is enhanced. Therefore, to provide the same optical depth as the fiducial model, reionization must be faster and finishes earlier, and therefore the source emissivity should also be larger. We can see from Table.I that ζ in IDE-A model is about 70% higher than the fiducial ΛCDM model.

Since the interaction proportional to DE density does not alter the expansion history and structure growth much during the reionization era, we will focus on IDE-A models, where the interaction is proportional to DM density and examine the influence of the model parameters. Fig.4 shows the ionized fraction and the bias of HII for models with different w and ξ_1. The model parameters are listed in Table.I. Obviously, IDE-A1 and IDE-A3 lines degenerate, which means that changing w does not affect the reionization history of the universe. Again, this is due to the negligibly small abundance of DE in the matter dominated epoch. The physical processes are independent of the dynamics of dark energy, even if it couples to dark matter. The parameter ξ_1, however, is important. Increasing ξ_1 the HII bias shoots up more quickly before the time of percolation, so that the reionization



(a) (b) (c)

FIG. 5: The 21cm power spectrum for IDE and ΛCDM model at (a) $z = 11$, (b) $z = 10$ and (c) $z = 9$.



(a) (b) (c)

FIG. 6: The 21cm power spectrum for IDE and ΛCDM model at (a) $f_{\rm HII} = 0.1$, (b) $f_{\rm HII} = 0.5$ and (c) $f_{\rm HII} = 0.9$.

is significantly speeded up, given the same Thomson optical depth. Thus, by studying the reionization history, one can break the degeneracy between DE equation of state w and the coupling constant ξ_1, which is generally found in the low redshift observations as well as CMB[24, 26, 27, 29, 86, 87] . Instead, ξ_1 is now degenerate with the emissivity(ζ) or optical depth($\tau_{\rm T}$).

With the numerically computed $f_{\rm HI}$ and $\delta_{\rm HII}$ in the presence of interaction between dark sectors, we can now calculate the 21cm power spectrum in IDE models. Since the interaction proportional to DE density is insignificant in the reionization era, we will only investigate the IDE-A models. We plot the 21cm power spectrum $p_{21}(k) \equiv P_{21}(k)/(\hat{T}_{\rm b} P_\Psi(k))$ in two IDE models and the ΛCDM model in Fig.5 at $z = 9, 10, 11$, respectively. $P_\Psi(k)$ is the primordial fluctuation power spectrum and $\hat{T}_{\rm b} \equiv 3hc^3 A_{10} \bar{n}_{\rm b}^0 (1 - f_{\rm He})/(32\pi k_{\rm B} \nu_0^2 H_0)$, where $\bar{n}_{\rm b}^0$ is the baryon number density at present. The shape of $p_{21}(k)$ for three models are similar. It is almost scale independent for subhorizon modes at earlier times, and later on the power at small scales becomes slightly lower than that on large scales. At $z = 11$ and $z = 10$, we find that the amplitude of $p_{21}(k)$ in the IDE-A1 model is the highest and the ΛCDM model is the lowest. When $z = 9$, however, the relative amplitudes among the models are reversed. This is attributed to that in the IDE-A models, reionization finishes earlier, and $p_{21}(k)$ drops rapidly with increasing $f_{\rm HII}$. If calculate the 21cm power spectra at the same $f_{\rm HII}$ instead of the same z, as shown in Fig.6, we find that the power sepctrum in ΛCDM model becomes closer to that in IDE models, or even exceeds the latter. This can be seen more clearly in Fig.7, in which we plotted the evolution of $P_{21}(z)$ as well as its components



FIG. 7: The 21cm power spectrum $P_{21}(k)$ and its components for IDE and ΛCDM model for $k = 0.034\text{Mpc}^{-1}$.



FIG. 8: The 21cm brightness temperature for ΛCDM and IDE models.

$P_0(z)$, $P_2(z)$ and $P_4(z)$ for $k = 0.034\text{Mpc}^{-1}$, assuming $(\hat{\mathbf{n}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{k}})^2 = 1$. In all models, $P_{21}(z)$ exhibits the similar behavior. It first grows with time. At this stage, the ionization bias $\delta_{\text{HII}}/\delta_{\text{b}}$ evolves slowly, the growth of power is mainly due to the growth of baryon overdensity δ_{b}. After the majority of hydrogen atoms are ionized, the bias quickly drops and approaches to unity, which, together with the decrease of neutral hydrogen, leads to the suppression of 21cm power. Enhancing the coupling strength, P_{21} grows, peaks and drops earlier, and the amplitude of the peak becomes lower.

Among the components of $P_{21}(k)$, $P_4(k)$ is of special interest, because it only depends on $P_{\rm bb}$ and do not involve the fluctuation to ionized fraction, thus can be used to probe the growth of structure during reionization era without relying on the detailed knowledge of reionization itself. Yet it is not entirely independent of reionization model. From (42), $P_4(k)$ is still modulated by the spatially averaged ionized fraction $f_{\rm HII} = 1 - f_{\rm HI}$. Our calculations suggest that $P_4(k)$ is always subdominant comparing with other components except at the beginning of reionization, which is a result of inside-out reionization, in which $\delta_{\rm HII}/\delta_{\rm b}$ is always greater than 1 and $P_{\rm ii}$ and $P_{\rm ib}$ are greater than $P_{\rm bb}$. But this would not hinder the measurement of $P_4(k)$. One can isolate $P_4(k)$ from overall 21cm radiation signals through its angular dependence-$P_4(k)$ in proportional to $(\hat{\mathbf{n}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{k}})^4$, which render it distinguishable from other components. Other than $P_0(k)$ and $P_2(k)$, $P_4(k)$ in the IDE-A models never exceeds that in the ΛCDM model. This is actually a direct consequence of that $P_4(k)$ only depends on $f_{\rm HII}$ but not on $\delta_{\rm HII}$. In IDE-A models, hydrogen gas is ionized faster, hence both $f_{\rm HII}$ and $\delta_{\rm HII}$ are larger than those in ΛCDM model at given redshift. $P_4(k)$ is then suppressed by low neutral hydrogen density. On the other hand, the other two components are enhanced due to high $\delta_{\rm HII}$ and can be larger than those of ΛCDM model.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we investigate reionization in an IDE scenario. We assume a phenomenological parametrization of the interaction between dark matter and dark energy, and study its influence on reionization. It is revealed that the presence of interaction between dark sectors would not alter reionization process if it is proportional to DE energy density. On the other hand, when the interaction is proportional to DM energy density as in IDE-A models, it will significantly affect reionization. Comparing with ΛCDM model, EoR needs to end earlier if Thomson optical depth remains the same. This implies stronger source emissivity of ionizing photons. Or, if the source emissivity is fixed, the expected optical depth will change with the coupling strength of the interaction. On the perturbation level, we find that the linear fluctuations to the ionized fraction in IDE models behave similarly as in ΛCDM model. For IDE-B models, the evolution of HII bias is indistinguishable from ΛCDM model, while for IDE-A models, $\delta_{\rm HII}(k)$ evolves faster given the same optical depth.

To investigate the signature of interaction between DM and DE during EoR, we compute the 3D power spectrum of redshifted 21 cm radiation in IDE-A models. Our theoretical predictions of $P_{21}(k)$ for IDE-A and ΛCDM models share the similar shape, yet there is a prominent time shift between them. The time shift, as well as the optical depth, depends on both the coupling strength and ionizing source emissivity. Thus we expect that these two parameters are degenerate in the 21 cm signals. However, it is possible to detect 21 cm signals from redshift range both before and after EoR, which can in principle avoid such degeneracy. We will explore this in the future work.

It is worth noting that the validity of linear perturbation theory on large scales needs further investigation, as small scale fluctuations can contribute to large scale modes through mode-mode couplings due to the presence of the nonlinear terms in the equations of the ionization balance and radiative transfer. However, for the purpose of studying the effect of DM-DE interaction on reionization qualitatively, the linear perturbation calculation should be sufficient.

Our work has only considered reionization by a soft source spectrum (dominated by UV photons from stars). It is argued recently that AGN may play a significant role in

re-ionizing the universe [88], suggesting that our understanding of the first generation of luminous sources is still uncertain. Therefore, to constrain the DM-DE intereaction theories with the future 21cm observations during the epoch of reionization, we need to further increase the dimension of the parameter space in our calculation. Our linear perturbation calculation provides a convenient tool for this type of purposes. We will study more complicated reionization scenarios in the future.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

X. X. is supported by the South African Research Chairs Initiative of the Department of Science and Technology and National Research Foundation of South Africa as well as the Competitive Programme for Rated Researchers (Grant Number 91552). J. Z. is supported by the NSFC grants (11433001 and 11673016), the National Key Basic Research Program of China (2015CB857001), and a grant (No.11DZ2260700) from the Office of Science and Technology in Shanghai Municipal Government. B. W acknowledge financial support from National Basic Research Program of China (973 Program 2013CB834900) and National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11375113). We would like to acknowledge helpful discussions with Elcio Abdalla and Yidong Xu.

[1] A. G. Riess, A. V. Filippenko, P. Challis, A. Clocchiattia, A. Diercks, P. M. Garnavich, R. L. Gilliland, C. J. Hogan, S. Jha, R. P. Kirshner, B. Leibundgut, M. M. Phillips, D. Reiss, B. P. Schmidt, R. A. Schommer, R. C. Smith, J. Spyromilio, C. Stubbs, N. B. Suntzeff, and J. Tonry, Astron.J. **116**, 1009 (1998).

[2] S. Perlmutter, G. Aldering, G. Goldhaber, R. A. Knop, P. Nugent, P. G. Castro, S. Deustua, S. Fabbro, A. Goobar, D. E. Groom, I. M. Hook, A. G. Kim, M. Y. Kim, J. C. Lee, N. J. Nunes, R. Pain, C. R. Pennypacker, R. Quimby, C. Lidman, R. S. Ellis, M. Irwin, R. G. McMahon, P. Ruiz-Lapuente, N. Walton, B. Schaefer, B. J. Boyle, A. V. Filippenko, T. Matheson, A. S. Fruchter, N. Panagia, H. J. M. Newberg, and W. J. Couch, Astrophys.J. **517**, 565 (1999).

[3] J. Oort, Bulletin of the Astronomical Institutes of the Netherlands **6**, 249 (1932).

[4] F. Zwicky, Helvetica Physica Acta **6**, 110 (1933).

[5] S. Smith, Astrophys. J. **83**, 23 (1936).

[6] V. C. Rubin and J. W. K. Ford, Astrophys. J. **159**, 379 (1970).

[7] V. C. Rubin, N. Thonnard, and J. W. K. Ford, Astrophys. J. **238**, 471 (1980).

[8] Y. Sofue and V. Rubin, Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys. **39**, 137 (2001).

[9] D. Clowe, M. Bradac, A. H. Gonzalez, M. Markevitch, S. W. Randall, C. Jones, and D. Zaritsky, Astrophys. J. **648**, L109 (2006).

[10] M. R. Nolta, J. Dunkley, R. S. Hill, G. Hinshaw, E. Komatsu, D. Larson, L. Page, D. N. Spergel, C. L. Bennett, B. Gold, N. Jarosik, N. Odegard, J. L. Weiland, E. Wollack, M. Halpern, A. Kogut, M. Limon, S. S. Meyer, G. S. Tucker, and E. L. Wright, Astrophys. J. Suppl. **180**, 296 (2009).

[11] S. Weinberg, Rev. Mod. Phys. **61**, 1 (1989).

[12] S. Weinberg, (2007), arXiv:0005265 [astro-ph].

[13] A. G. Riess, L. M. Macri, S. L. Hoffmann, D. Scolnic, S. Casertano, A. V. Filippenko, B. E.

Tucker, M. J. Reid, D. O. Jones, J. M. Silverman, R. Chornock, P. Challis, W. Yuan, P. J. Brown, and R. J. Foley, The Astrophysical Journal **826**, 56 (2016), arXiv:1604.01424.

[14] P. Planck Collaboration, N. Aghanim, M. Ashdown, J. Aumont, C. Baccigalupi, M. Ballardini, A. J. Banday, R. B. Barreiro, N. Bartolo, S. Basak, R. Battye, K. Benabed, J. P. Bernard, M. Bersanelli, P. Bielewicz, J. J. Bock, A. Bonaldi, L. Bonavera, J. R. Bond, J. Borrill, F. R. Bouchet, F. Boulanger, M. Bucher, C. Burigana, R. C. Butler, E. Calabrese, J. F. Cardoso, J. Carron, A. Challinor, H. C. Chiang, L. P. L. Colombo, C. Combet, B. Comis, A. Coulais, B. P. Crill, A. Curto, F. Cuttaia, R. J. Davis, P. de Bernardis, A. de Rosa, G. de Zotti, J. Delabrouille, J. M. Delouis, E. Di Valentino, C. Dickinson, J. M. Diego, O. Doré, M. Douspis, A. Ducout, X. Dupac, G. Efstathiou, F. Elsner, T. A. Enßlin, H. K. Eriksen, E. Falgarone, Y. Fantaye, F. Finelli, F. Forastieri, M. Frailis, A. A. Fraisse, E. Franceschi, A. Frolov, S. Galeotta, S. Galli, K. Ganga, R. T. Génova-Santos, M. Gerbino, T. Ghosh, J. González-Nuevo, K. M. Górski, S. Gratton, A. Gruppuso, J. E. Gudmundsson, F. K. Hansen, G. Helou, S. Henrot-Versillé, D. Herranz, E. Hivon, Z. Huang, S. Ilic, A. H. Jaffe, W. C. Jones, E. Keihänen, R. Keskitalo, T. S. Kisner, L. Knox, N. Krachmalnicoff, M. Kunz, H. Kurki-Suonio, G. Lagache, J. M. Lamarre, M. Langer, A. Lasenby, M. Lattanzi, C. R. Lawrence, M. L. Jeune, J. P. Leahy, F. Levrier, M. Liguori, P. B. Lilje, M. López-Caniego, Y. Z. Ma, J. F. Macías-Pérez, G. Maggio, A. Mangilli, M. Maris, P. G. Martin, E. Martínez-González, S. Matarrese, N. Mauri, J. D. McEwen, P. R. Meinhold, A. Melchiorri, A. Mennella, M. Migliaccio, M. A. Miville-Deschênes, D. Molinari, A. Moneti, L. Montier, G. Morgante, A. Moss, S. Mottet, P. Naselsky, P. Natoli, C. A. Oxborrow, L. Pagano, D. Paoletti, B. Partridge, G. Patanchon, L. Patrizii, O. Perdereau, L. Perotto, V. Pettorino, F. Piacentini, S. Plaszczynski, L. Polastri, G. Polenta, J. L. Puget, J. P. Rachen, B. Racine, M. Reinecke, M. Remazeilles, A. Renzi, G. Rocha, M. Rossetti, G. Roudier, J. A. Rubiño-Martín, B. Ruiz-Granados, L. Salvati, M. Sandri, M. Savelainen, D. Scott, G. Sirri, R. Sunyaev, A. S. Suur-Uski, J. A. Tauber, M. Tenti, L. Toffolatti, M. Tomasi, M. Tristram, T. Trombetti, J. Valiviita, F. Van Tent, L. Vibert, P. Vielva, F. Villa, N. Vittorio, B. D. Wandelt, R. Watson, I. K. Wehus, M. White, A. Zacchei, and A. Zonca, A&A **596**, A107 (2016), arXiv:1605.02985.

[15] B. Wang, E. Abdalla, F. Atrio-Barandela, and D. Pavón, Reports on Progress in Physics **79**, 096901 (2016), arXiv:1603.08299.

[16] L. Amendola and C. Quercellini, Phys.Rev.D **68**, 23514 (2003).

[17] B. Wang, J. Zang, C.-Y. Lin, E. Abdalla, and S. Micheletti, Nucl.Phys.B **778**, 69 (2007).

[18] C. Feng, B. Wang, Y. Gong, and R.-K. Su, JCAP **09**, 5 (2007).

[19] C. Feng, B. Wang, E. Abdalla, and R.-K. Su, Phys.Lett.B **665**, 111 (2008).

[20] J.-Q. Xia, Phys.Rev.D **80**, 103514 (2009).

[21] M. Martinelli, L. L. Honorez, A. Melchiorri, and O. Mena, Phys.Rev.D **81**, 103534 (2010).

[22] J. Valiviita, R. Maartens, and E. Majerotto, Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc. **402,**, 2355 (2009).

[23] L. L. Honorez, B. A. Reid, O. Mena, L. Verde, and R. Jimenez, JCAP **1009**, 29 (2010), arXiv:1006.0877.

[24] J.-H. He, B. Wang, and P. Zhang, Phys.Rev. D **80**, 63530 (2009), arXiv:0906.0677 [gr-qc].

[25] J.-H. He, B. Wang, and E. Abdalla, Phys.Rev.D **83**, 63515 (2011), arXiv:1012.3904.

[26] X.-D. Xu, J.-H. He, and B. Wang, Phys.Lett. B **701**, 513 (2011).

[27] X.-D. Xu, B. Wang, P. Zhang, and F. Atrio-Barandela, Journal of Cosmology and Astroparticle Physics **12**, 1 (2013).

[28] V. Salvatelli, A. Marchini, L. Lopez-Honorez, and O. Mena, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 23531 (2013).

[29] A. A. Costa, X.-D. Xu, B. Wang, M. Ferreira Elisa G.\, E. Abdalla, E. G. M. Ferreira, and

E. Abdalla, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 103531 (2014).
[30] V. Salvatelli, N. Said, M. Bruni, A. Melchiorri, and D. Wands, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 181301 (2014).
[31] Y. H. Li, J. F. Zhang, and X. Zhang, Physical Review D **90**, 063005 (2014), arXiv:1404.5220.
[32] O. Bertolami, F. G. Pedro, and M. L. Delliou, Phys.Lett.B **654**, 165 (2007).
[33] E. Abdalla, L. R. Abramo, L. Sodre, and B. Wang, Physics Letters B **673**, 107 (2009).
[34] E. Abdalla, L. R. Abramo, and J. C. C. de Souza, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 023508 (2009).
[35] R. Murgia, S. Gariazzo, and N. Fornengo, JCAP **04**, 014 (2016), arXiv:1602.01765.
[36] Y.-H. Li and X. Zhang, Phys.Rev. D **89**, 083009 (2014), arXiv:1312.6328.
[37] W. Yang and L. Xu, Phys. Rev. D **90**, 083532 (2014), arXiv:1409.5533.
[38] J.-Q. Xia, JCAP **11**, 022 (2013), arXiv:1311.2131.
[39] J. C. Fabris, B. Fraga, N. Pinto-Neto, and W. Zimdahl, JCAP **04**, 008 (2010), arXiv:0910.3246.
[40] Z.-K. Guo, N. Ohta, and S. Tsujikawa, Phys.Rev. D **76**, 023508 (2007), arXiv:0702015 [astro-ph].
[41] A. A. Costa, X.-D. Xu, B. Wang, and E. Abdalla, JCAP **01**, 028 (2017), arXiv:1605.04138.
[42] P. Planck Collaboration, R. Adam, N. Aghanim, M. Ashdown, J. Aumont, C. Baccigalupi, M. Ballardini, A. J. Banday, R. B. Barreiro, N. Bartolo, S. Basak, R. Battye, K. Benabed, J. P. Bernard, M. Bersanelli, P. Bielewicz, J. J. Bock, A. Bonaldi, L. Bonavera, J. R. Bond, J. Borrill, F. R. Bouchet, M. Bucher, C. Burigana, E. Calabrese, J. F. Cardoso, J. Carron, H. C. Chiang, L. P. L. Colombo, C. Combet, B. Comis, A. Coulais, B. P. Crill, A. Curto, F. Cuttaia, R. J. Davis, P. de Bernardis, A. de Rosa, G. de Zotti, J. Delabrouille, E. Di Valentino, C. Dickinson, J. M. Diego, O. Doré, M. Douspis, A. Ducout, X. Dupac, F. Elsner, T. A. Enßlin, H. K. Eriksen, E. Falgarone, Y. Fantaye, F. Finelli, F. Forastieri, M. Frailis, A. A. Fraisse, E. Franceschi, A. Frolov, S. Galeotta, S. Galli, K. Ganga, R. T. Génova-Santos, M. Gerbino, T. Ghosh, J. González-Nuevo, K. M. Górski, A. Gruppuso, J. E. Gudmundsson, F. K. Hansen, G. Helou, S. Henrot-Versillé, D. Herranz, E. Hivon, Z. Huang, S. Ili_, A. H. Jaffe, W. C. Jones, E. Keihänen, R. Keskitalo, T. S. Kisner, L. Knox, N. Krachmalnicoff, M. Kunz, H. Kurki-Suonio, G. Lagache, A. Lähteenmäki, J. M. Lamarre, M. Langer, A. Lasenby, M. Lattanzi, C. R. Lawrence, M. L. Jeune, F. Levrier, A. Lewis, M. Liguori, P. B. Lilje, M. López-Caniego, Y. Z. Ma, J. F. Macías-Pérez, G. Maggio, A. Mangilli, M. Maris, P. G. Martin, E. Martínez-González, S. Matarrese, N. Mauri, J. D. McEwen, P. R. Meinhold, A. Melchiorri, A. Mennella, M. Migliaccio, M. A. Miville-Deschênes, D. Molinari, A. Moneti, L. Montier, G. Morgante, A. Moss, P. Naselsky, P. Natoli, C. A. Oxborrow, L. Pagano, D. Paoletti, B. Partridge, G. Patanchon, L. Patrizii, O. Perdereau, L. Perotto, V. Pettorino, F. Piacentini, S. Plaszczynski, L. Polastri, G. Polenta, J. L. Puget, J. P. Rachen, B. Racine, M. Reinecke, M. Remazeilles, A. Renzi, G. Rocha, M. Rossetti, G. Roudier, J. A. Rubiño-Martín, B. Ruiz-Granados, L. Salvati, M. Sandri, M. Savelainen, D. Scott, G. Sirri, R. Sunyaev, A. S. Suur-Uski, J. A. Tauber, M. Tenti, L. Toffolatti, M. Tomasi, M. Tristram, T. Trombetti, J. Valiviita, F. Van Tent, P. Vielva, F. Villa, N. Vittorio, B. D. Wandelt, I. K. Wehus, M. White, A. Zacchei, and A. Zonca, A&A **596**, A108 (2016), arXiv:1605.03507.
[43] X. Fan, M. A. Strauss, R. H. Becker, R. L. White, J. E. Gunn, G. R. Knapp, G. T. Richards, D. P. Schneider, J. Brinkmann, and M. Fukugita, Astron.J. **132**, 117 (2006).
[44] C. L. Carilli, R. Wang, X. Fan, F. Walter, J. Kurk, D. Riechers, J. Wagg, J. Hennawi, L. Jiang, K. M. Menten, F. Bertoldi, M. A. Strauss, and P. Cox, ApJ **714**, 834 (2010), arXiv:1003.0016.
[45] D. J. Mortlock, S. J. Warren, B. P. Venemans, M. Patel, P. C. Hewett, R. G. McMahon,

C. Simpson, T. Theuns, E. A. Gonzales-Solares, A. Adamson, S. Dye, N. C. Hambly, P. Hirst, M. J. Irwin, E. Kuiper, A. Lawrence, and H. J. A. Rottgering, Nature **474**, 616 (2011), arXiv:1106.6088.

[46] J. Caruana, A. J. Bunker, S. M. Wilkins, E. R. Stanway, S. Lorenzoni, M. J. Jarvis, and H. Elbert, MNRAS **443**, 2831 (2014), arXiv:1311.0057.

[47] M. A. Schenker, R. S. Ellis, N. P. Konidaris, and D. P. Stark, ApJ **795**, 20 (2014), arXiv:1404.4632.

[48] M. P. van Haarlem, M. W. Wise, A. W. Gunst, G. Heald, J. P. McKean, J. W. T. Hessels, A. G. de Bruyn, R. Nijboer, J. Swinbank, R. Fallows, M. Brentjens, A. Nelles, R. Beck, H. Falcke, R. Fender, J. Hörandel, L. V. E. Koopmans, G. Mann, G. Miley, H. Röttgering, B. W. Stappers, R. A. M. J. Wijers, S. Zaroubi, M. van den Akker, A. Alexov, J. Anderson, K. Anderson, A. van Ardenne, M. Arts, A. Asgekar, I. M. Avruch, F. Batejat, L. Bähren, M. E. Bell, M. R. Bell, I. van Bemmel, P. Bennema, M. J. Bentum, G. Bernardi, P. Best, L. Bîrzan, A. Bonafede, A. J. Boonstra, R. Braun, J. Bregman, F. Breitling, R. H. van de Brink, J. Broderick, P. C. Broekema, W. N. Brouw, M. Brüggen, H. R. Butcher, W. van Cappellen, B. Ciardi, T. Coenen, J. Conway, A. Coolen, A. Corstanje, S. Damstra, O. Davies, A. T. Deller, R. J. Dettmar, G. van Diepen, K. Dijkstra, P. Donker, A. Doorduin, J. Dromer, M. Drost, A. van Duin, J. Eislöffel, J. van Enst, C. Ferrari, W. Frieswijk, H. Gankema, M. A. Garrett, F. de Gasperin, M. Gerbers, E. de Geus, J. M. Grießmeier, T. Grit, P. Gruppen, J. P. Hamaker, T. Hassall, M. Hoeft, H. Holties, A. Horneffer, A. van der Horst, A. van Houwelingen, A. Huijgen, M. Iacobelli, H. Intema, N. Jackson, V. Jelic, A. de Jong, E. Juette, D. Kant, A. Karastergiou, A. Koers, H. Kollen, V. I. Kondratiev, E. Kooistra, Y. Koopman, A. Koster, M. Kuniyoshi, M. Kramer, G. Kuper, P. Lambropoulos, C. Law, J. van Leeuwen, J. Lemaitre, M. Loose, P. Maat, G. Macario, S. Markoff, J. Masters, D. McKay-Bukowski, H. Meijering, H. Meulman, M. Mevius, E. Middelberg, R. Millenaar, J. C. A. Miller-Jones, R. N. Mohan, J. D. Mol, J. Morawietz, R. Morganti, D. D. Mulcahy, E. Mulder, H. Munk, L. Nieuwenhuis, R. van Nieuwpoort, J. E. Noordam, M. Norden, A. Noutsos, A. R. Offringa, H. Olofsson, A. Omar, E. Orrú, R. Overeem, H. Paas, M. Pandey-Pommier, V. N. Pandey, R. Pizzo, A. Polatidis, D. Rafferty, S. Rawlings, W. Reich, J. P. de Reijer, J. Reitsma, A. Renting, P. Riemers, E. Rol, J. W. Romein, J. Roosjen, M. Ruiter, A. Scaife, K. van der Schaaf, B. Scheers, P. Schellart, A. Schoenmakers, G. Schoonderbeek, M. Serylak, A. Shulevski, J. Sluman, O. Smirnov, C. Sobey, H. Spreeuw, M. Steinmetz, C. G. M. Sterks, H. J. Stiepel, K. Stuurwold, M. Tagger, Y. Tang, C. Tasse, I. Thomas, S. Thoudam, M. C. Toribio, B. van der Tol, O. Usov, M. van Veelen, A. J. van der Veen, S. ter Veen, J. P. W. Verbiest, R. Vermeulen, N. Vermaas, C. Vocks, C. Vogt, M. de Vos, E. van der Wal, R. van Weeren, H. Weggemans, P. Weltevrede, S. White, S. J. Wijnholds, T. Wilhelmsson, O. Wucknitz, S. Yatawatta, P. Zarka, A. Zensus, and J. van Zwieten, Astronomy and Astrophysics **556**, A2 (2013), arXiv:1305.3550.

[49] S. Yatawatta, A. G. de Bruyn, M. A. Brentjens, P. Labropoulos, V. N. Pandey, S. Kazemi, S. Zaroubi, L. V. E. Koopmans, A. R. Offringa, V. Jelic, O. M. Rubi, V. Veligatla, S. J. Wijnholds, W. N. Brouw, G. Bernardi, B. Ciardi, S. Daiboo, G. Harker, G. Mellema, J. Schaye, R. Thomas, H. Vedantham, E. Chapman, F. B. Abdalla, A. Alexov, J. Anderson, I. M. Avruch, F. Batejat, M. E. Bell, M. R. Bell, M. Bentum, P. Best, A. Bonafede, J. Bregman, F. Breitling, R. H. van de Brink, J. W. Broderick, M. Bruggen, J. Conway, F. de Gasperin, E. de Geus, S. Duscha, H. Falcke, R. A. Fallows, C. Ferrari, W. Frieswijk, M. A. Garrett, J. M. Griessmeier, A. W. Gunst, T. E. Hassall, J. W. T. Hessels, M. Hoeft, M. Iacobelli, E. Juette, A. Karastergiou, V. I. Kondratiev, M. Kramer, M. Kuniyoshi, G. Kuper, J. van

Leeuwen, P. Maat, G. Mann, J. P. McKean, M. Mevius, J. D. Mol, H. Munk, R. Nijboer, J. E. Noordam, M. J. Norden, E. Orru, H. Paas, M. Pandey-Pommier, R. Pizzo, A. G. Polatidis, W. Reich, H. J. A. Rottgering, J. Sluman, O. Smirnov, B. Stappers, M. Steinmetz, M. Tagger, Y. Tang, C. Tasse, S. ter Veen, R. Vermeulen, R. J. van Weeren, M. Wise, O. Wucknitz, and P. Zarka, Astronomy and Astrophysics **550**, 136 (2013), arXiv:1301.1630.

[50] S. J. Tingay, R. Goeke, J. D. Bowman, D. Emrich, S. M. Ord, D. A. Mitchell, M. F. Morales, T. Booler, B. Crosse, D. Pallot, A. Wicenec, W. Arcus, D. Barnes, G. Bernardi, F. Briggs, S. Burns, J. D. Bunton, R. J. Cappallo, T. Colegate, B. E. Corey, A. Deshpande, L. DeSouza, B. M. Gaensler, L. J. Greenhill, J. Hall, B. J. Hazelton, D. Herne, J. N. Hewitt, M. Johnston-Hollitt, D. L. Kaplan, J. C. Kasper, B. B. Kincaid, R. Koenig, E. Kratzenberg, C. J. Lonsdale, M. J. Lynch, B. McKinley, S. R. McWhirter, E. Morgan, D. Oberoi, J. Pathikulangara, T. Prabu, R. A. Remillard, A. E. E. Rogers, A. Roshi, J. E. Salah, R. J. Sault, N. Udaya-Shankar, F. Schlagenhaufer, K. S. Srivani, J. Stevens, R. Subrahmanyan, S. Tremblay, R. B. Wayth, M. Waterson, R. L. Webster, A. R. Whitney, A. Williams, C. L. Williams, and J. S. B. Wyithe, Publications of the Astronomical Society of Australia **30**, e007 (2013), arXiv:1206.6945.

[51] J. D. Bowman, I. Cairns, D. L. Kaplan, T. Murphy, D. Oberoi, L. Staveley-Smith, W. Arcus, D. G. Barnes, G. Bernardi, F. H. Briggs, S. Brown, J. D. Bunton, A. J. Burgasser, R. J. Cappallo, S. Chatterjee, B. E. Corey, A. Coster, A. Deshpande, L. DeSouza, D. Emrich, P. Erickson, R. F. Goeke, B. M. Gaensler, L. J. Greenhill, L. Harvey-Smith, B. J. Hazelton, D. Herne, J. N. Hewitt, M. Johnston-Hollitt, J. C. Kasper, B. B. Kincaid, R. Koenig, E. Kratzenberg, C. J. Lonsdale, M. J. Lynch, L. D. Matthews, S. R. McWhirter, D. A. Mitchell, M. F. Morales, E. H. Morgan, S. M. Ord, J. Pathikulangara, P. Thiagaraj, R. A. Remillard, T. Robishaw, A. E. E. Rogers, A. A. Roshi, J. E. Salah, R. J. Sault, N. U. Shankar, K. S. Srivani, J. B. Stevens, R. Subrahmanyan, S. J. Tingay, R. B. Wayth, M. Waterson, R. L. Webster, A. R. Whitney, A. J. Williams, C. L. Williams, and J. S. B. Wyithe, Publications of the Astronomical Society of Australia **30**, e031 (2013), arXiv:1212.5151.

[52] A. R. Parsons, A. Liu, J. E. Aguirre, Z. S. Ali, R. F. Bradley, C. L. Carilli, D. R. DeBoer, M. R. Dexter, N. E. Gugliucci, D. C. Jacobs, P. Klima, D. H. E. MacMahon, J. R. Manley, D. F. Moore, J. C. Pober, I. I. Stefan, and W. P. Walbrugh, ApJ **788**, 106 (2014), arXiv:1304.4991.

[53] D. C. Jacobs, J. C. Pober, A. R. Parsons, J. E. Aguirre, Z. Ali, J. Bowman, R. F. Bradley, C. L. Carilli, D. R. DeBoer, M. R. Dexter, N. E. Gugliucci, P. Klima, A. Liu, D. H. E. MacMahon, J. R. Manley, D. F. Moore, I. I. Stefan, and W. P. Walbrugh, The Astrophysical Journal **801**, 51 (2015), arXiv:1408.3389.

[54] Z. S. Ali, A. R. Parsons, H. Zheng, J. C. Pober, A. Liu, J. E. Aguirre, R. F. Bradley, G. Bernardi, C. L. Carilli, C. Cheng, D. R. DeBoer, M. R. Dexter, J. Grobbelaar, J. Horrell, D. C. Jacobs, P. Klima, D. H. E. MacMahon, M. Maree, D. F. Moore, N. Razavi, I. I. Stefan, W. P. Walbrugh, and A. Walker, The Astrophysical Journal **809**, 61 (2015), arXiv:1502.06016.

[55] J. C. Pober, A. Liu, J. S. Dillon, J. E. Aguirre, J. D. Bowman, R. F. Bradley, C. L. Carilli, D. R. DeBoer, J. N. Hewitt, D. C. Jacobs, M. McQuinn, M. F. Morales, A. R. Parsons, M. Tegmark, and D. J. Werthimer, The Astrophysical Journal **782**, 66 (2014), arXiv:1310.7031.

[56] R. A. Battye, I. W. A. Browne, C. Dickinson, G. Heron, B. Maffei, and A. Pourtsidou, MNRAS **434**, 1239 (2013), arXiv:1209.0343.

[57] Http://www.skatelescope.org.

[58] K. Kohler, N. Y. Gnedin, and A. J. S. Hamilton, ApJ **657**, 15 (2005),

arXiv:0511627 [astro-ph].
[59] I. T. Iliev, G. Mellema, U.-L. Pen, H. Merz, P. R. Shapiro, and M. A. Alvarez, MNRAS **369**, 1625 (2005), arXiv:0512187 [astro-ph].
[60] I. T. Iliev, U.-L. Pen, J. R. Bond, G. Mellema, and P. R. Shapiro, New Astronomy Reviews **50**, 909 (2006), arXiv:0607209 [astro-ph].
[61] O. Zahn, A. Lidz, M. McQuinn, S. Dutta, L. Hernquist, M. Zaldarriaga, and S. R. Furlanetto, The Astrophysical Journal **654**, 12 (2006), arXiv:0604177 [astro-ph].
[62] M. McQuinn, A. Lidz, O. Zahn, S. Dutta, L. Hernquist, and M. Zaldarriaga, MNRAS **377**, 1043 (2007), arXiv:0610094 [astro-ph].
[63] K.-G. Lee, R. Cen, J. R. Gott, and H. Trac, ApJ **675**, 8 (2007), arXiv:0708.2431.
[64] M.-S. Shin, H. Trac, and R. Cen, ApJ **681**, 756 (2007), arXiv:0708.2425.
[65] I. T. Iliev, P. R. Shapiro, G. Mellema, U.-L. Pen, P. McDonald, and M. A. Alvarez, Astrophysics and Space Science **320**, 39 (2009), arXiv:0710.2451.
[66] D. Aubert and R. Teyssier, ApJ **724**, 244 (2010), arXiv:1004.2503.
[67] M. M. Friedrich, G. Mellema, M. A. Alvarez, P. R. Shapiro, and I. T. Iliev, MNRAS **413**, 1353 (2011), arXiv:1006.2016.
[68] I. T. Iliev, G. Mellema, K. Ahn, P. R. Shapiro, Y. Mao, and U.-L. Pen, MNRAS **439**, 725 (2014), arXiv:1310.7463.
[69] G. C. So, M. L. Norman, D. R. Reynolds, and R. P. Harkness, ApJ **789**, 149 (2014), arXiv:1311.2152.
[70] M. L. Norman, D. R. Reynolds, G. C. So, R. P. Harkness, and J. H. Wise, The Astrophysical Journal Supplement **216**, 16 (2015), arXiv:1306.0645.
[71] J. Miralda-Escude, M. Haehnelt, and M. J. Rees, ApJ **530**, 1 (2000), arXiv:9812306 [astro-ph].
[72] S. Furlanetto, M. Zaldarriaga, and L. Hernquist, Astrophys.J. **613**, 1 (2004).
[73] A. Mesinger and S. Furlanetto, ApJ **669** (2007), 10.1086/521806, arXiv:0704.0946.
[74] M. Kuhlen and C. A. Faucher-Giguere, MNRAS **423**, 862 (2012), arXiv:1201.0757.
[75] J. Zhang, L. Hui, and Z. Haiman, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society **375**, 324 (2007).
[76] J.-H. He and B. Wang, JCAP **06**, 10 (2008), arXiv:0801.4233.
[77] J.-H. He, B. Wang, and E. Abdalla, Phys.Lett.B **671**, 139 (2008).
[78] M. B. Gavela, D. Hernandez, L. L. Honorez, O. Mena, and S. Rigolin, JCAP **07**, 34 (2009).
[79] D. Osterbrock and G. Ferland, Astrophysics of gaseous nebulae and active galactic nuclei, 2nd.˜ed. (University Science Books, 2006).
[80] J. Shull and M. van Steenberg, ApJ **298**, 268 (1985).
[81] W. Press and P. Schechter, ApJ **187**, 425 (1974).
[82] J. Bond, S. Cole, G. Efstathiou, and N. Kaiser, ApJ **379**, 440 (1991).
[83] C. Lacey and S. Cole, MNRAS **262**, 627 (1993).
[84] A. Lewis and A. Challinor, Phys.Rev.D **76**, 83005 (2007).
[85] Y. Mao, M. Tegmark, M. McQuinn, M. Zaldarriaga, and O. Zahn, Phys.Rev.D **78**, 23529 (2008).
[86] J.-H. He, B. Wang, E. Abdalla, and D. Pavon, JCAP **1012**, 22 (2009), arXiv:1001.0079.
[87] J.-H. He, B. Wang, and Y. P. Jing, JCAP **07**, 30 (2009).
[88] G. Kulkarni, T. R. Choudhury, E. Puchwein, and M. G. Haehnelt, (2017), arXiv:1701.04408.